

included in said list of suggested television programs, and a second mode wherein ~~programs~~ a program having at least one characteristic which has a zero weight in said table ~~are not suggested~~ is not included in said list of suggested television programs; and

generating said list of suggested television programs by sorting said schedule according to said characteristics of scheduled programs, said table of characteristics weights for said user, said mode selection, and said future time period selection.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-9, and 23 have been amended to more clearly state the invention as claimed therein. Claim 8 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error. Claim 21 also has been amended to correct a minor typographical error therein. No new matter is raised by these amendments to the claims, and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

The final Office Action of May 3, 2006 has been carefully reviewed, and these remarks are responsive thereto.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-14, 16-18, and 20-23 are pending. Claims 2, 10, 15, and 19 were cancelled in the previous amendment. Applicants note with appreciation that claims 11-14, 16-18, and 20-22 have been allowed.

Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 20 were objected to because they were identified as (Original) but should have been identified as (Currently Amended). Claim 23 was objected to because it was not necessary to underline this newly presented claim. These claims are now identified as (Previously Presented), and incorporate the amendments made in the previous response. It is believed that this indication of their status overcomes the objection to these claims.

Claims 1, 3-9, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,801,747 Bedard in view of EP 1 091 581 A2 Smith, U.S. Patent 5,610,653 Abecassis, and U.S. Patent 6,701,523 Hancock. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as amended recites:

1. A television system for generating a list of suggested scheduled television programs comprising:

means for receiving television program schedule data comprising broadcast time and characteristics of scheduled programs;

means for receiving characteristics data for a television program being viewed by a user;

means for storing at least one characteristics relevancy factor;

means for storing a table of characteristic weights for a user;

means for periodically incrementing characteristic weights in said table based on said characteristics data for said television program being viewed by said user and said at least one characteristics relevancy factor;

first user interface means for selecting a future time period and for requesting a list of suggested television programs scheduled to be broadcast during said future time period;

second user interface means for selecting between a first mode wherein a television program having a plurality of characteristics wherein at least one of said plurality of characteristics has a zero weight in said table of characteristic weights for a user is included in said list of suggested television programs, and a second mode wherein a television program having at least one characteristic which has a zero weight in said table is not included in said list of suggested television programs;

and processor means for generating said list of suggested television programs by sorting said schedule according to said characteristics of scheduled programs, said table of characteristics weights for said user, said mode selection, and said future time period selection.

Claim 23 as amended recites:

23. A method for generating a list of suggested scheduled television programs to a user comprising:

receiving television program schedule data comprising broadcast time and characteristics of scheduled programs;

receiving characteristics data for a television program being viewed by a user;

storing at least one characteristics relevancy factor;

storing a table of characteristic weights for a user;

periodically incrementing characteristic weights in said table based on said characteristics data for said television program being viewed by said user and said at least one characteristics relevancy factor;

selecting a future time period and for requesting a list of suggested television programs scheduled to be broadcast during said future time period;

selecting between a first mode wherein a program having a plurality of characteristics wherein at least one of said plurality of characteristics has a zero weight in said table of characteristic weights for a user is not included in said list of suggested television programs, and a second mode wherein a program having at least one characteristic which has a zero weight in said table is not included in said list of suggested television programs; and

generating said list of suggested television programs by sorting said schedule according to said characteristics of scheduled programs, said table of characteristics weights for said user, said mode selection, and said future time period selection.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited art of record, either alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest the invention of claims 1 and 23 as presented herein.

Bedard discloses a viewer profile with information regarding the channels and programming watched by a viewer, and discloses use of such a profile to provide a list of program listings based on the viewer's most-often watched channels and/or programming categories. Smith discloses means for selecting a future time period and permitting a display of programming for that selected future time period. It is respectfully submitted that Smith does not disclose or suggest the selection of a future time period as in the present invention, which relates to display of television program *listings* for a future time period, and not the underlying television programming itself, as in Smith.

Moreover, as the Examiner acknowledges, Bedard merely receives data relating to program characteristics, i.e., program category and/or subcategory, and stores a viewer profile containing characteristics weights of programming watched by a user based merely on the time (i.e., number of viewing units) spent watching programming with a particular category or subcategory; Bedard does not disclose or suggest the system and method of the present invention, which uses a characteristics

relevancy factor in addition to time watched to increment the characteristics weights given to particular programming in the user's viewer profile.

The Examiner attempts to use Abecassis to remedy this deficiency of Bedard and Smith. However, Abecassis is concerned with providing customized content-on-demand, customizing *the programming itself* to provide a user-specific version of programming based on the use of characteristics relevancy factors. See Abecassis at col. 2, lines 18-24; col. 7, lines 26-34. This is directly in contrast to the invention in claims 1 and 23 as amended herein, which does not alter the underlying programming but merely uses the characteristics of the program and the characteristics relevancy factors to present a customized *list* of programming available to all viewers. Thus, even if there were a motivation to combine Abecassis with Bedard and Smith, the combination of Abecassis with Bedard and Smith does not disclose or suggest the invention as in the present claims.

Hancock merely teaches the use of multiple user selectable modes for display of the television program guide, and does not overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Abecassis, Bedard, and Smith with respect to the presently claimed invention.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Abecassis with Bedard, Smith, and Hancock does not disclose or suggest the invention presently claimed in claims 1 and 23, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 23 over Bedard, Smith, Abecassis, and Hancock is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-9 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable over the combination of Bedard, Smith, Abecassis and Hancock for the reasons set forth above and in view of the additional novel features contained therein. As noted above, claims 11-14, 16-18, and 20-22 have been allowed. Thus, all pending claims are allowable over the art of record; withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the invention as claimed herein. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-9, 11-14, 16-18, and 20-23 are allowable over the cited prior art, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Appln. No.: 09/879,573

Response to Final Office Action mailed December 27, 2005

Please charge any fees required by this amendment or credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Wang et al.

Date: 4/12/06

By: Catherine A. Ferguson
Catherine A. Ferguson
Reg. No. 40,877
(609) 734-6440

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing, Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-0028

Appln. No.: 09/879,573

Response to Final Office Action mailed December 27, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on April 12, 2006 with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Filiz Karwaski Filiz Karwaski
Name Signature